

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary**

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application. Although Applicant disagrees with the broad grounds of rejection set forth in the Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, 14, 23 and 30 in order to facilitate prosecution on the merits. Support for the above amendments can be found in the specification at least at paragraph [0037]. As such, no new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are requested.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-9, 11-15, 17-24, 26-30 and 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Publication No. 2002/0065860 A1 to Grisenthwaite et al. (hereinafter "Grisenthwaite"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

The factual determination of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the identical disclosure, either implicitly or inherently, of each element of a claimed invention in a single reference. Moreover, the anticipating prior art reference must describe the recited invention with sufficient clarity and detail to establish that the claimed limitations existed in the prior art and that such existence would be recognized by one having ordinary skill in the art. Absence from an allegedly anticipating prior art reference of any claimed element negates anticipation. Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible, Inc., 793 F.2d 1565, 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (emphasis added).

Applicant submits that t Grisenthwaite fails to teach each and every element recited in claims 1-9, 11-15, 17-24, 26-30 and 32-36 and thus they define over Grisenthwaite. For example, with respect to claim 1, Grisenthwaite fails to teach at least the following language:

zero-extending a plurality of unsigned data operands of the decoded pixels using qualifiers to determine whether the upper or lower unsigned data operands are operated on to produce a plurality of unpacked data operands.

According to the Office Action, the above-recited language is disclosed by Grisenthwaite at [0129] and Figures 4 and 5. This assertion is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 defines over Grisenthwaite because Grisenthwaite fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least zero-extending a plurality of unsigned data operands of the decoded pixels using qualifiers to determine whether the upper or lower unsigned data operands are operated on to produce a plurality of unpacked data operands. As provided for in the Specification, zero-extending a plurality of unsigned data operands of the decoded pixels using qualifiers to determine whether the upper or lower unsigned data operands are operated on provides a significant technical advantage because it allows the device to not use up a significant memory bandwidth and the processing can be accomplished in fewer computing cycles.

Grisenthwaite teaches a data processing apparatus and method for saturating data values. *See* abstract. Grisenthwaite further teaches an inverse discrete cosine transform and adding a signed value to an unsigned value. *See* [0129]. Grisenthwaite's figures 4 and 5 show non-adjacent portions being shifted and using zero or sign extensions.

Claim 1 teaches zero-extending a plurality of unsigned data operands of the decoded pixels using qualifiers to determine whether the upper or lower unsigned data operands are operated on. Nowhere does Grisenthwaite teach using qualifiers to determine whether the upper or lower unsigned data operands are operated on. Consequently, Grisenthwaite fails to provide an identical disclosure of at least this element of the claimed subject matter.

Absence from Grisenthwaite of the above-mentioned claim elements negates anticipation. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 2-8 which depend from claim 1, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from Grisenthwaite.

Independent claims 9, 14, 23 and 30 recite elements similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that 9, 14, 23 and 30 are not anticipated and are patentable over Grisenthwaite for reasons analogous to those

presented with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 9, 14, 23 and 30. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 11-13, 15, 17-22, 24, 26-29, 32-36 that depend from 9, 14, 23 and 30, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from Grisenthwaite.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 10, 16, 25 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Publication No. 2002/0065860 A1 to Grisenthwaite et al. (hereinafter "Grisenthwaite") in view of United States Publication No. 2002/0083311 A1 to Paver (hereinafter "Paver"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

As recited above, Applicants respectfully submit that Grisenthwaite fails to disclose each and every element recited in independent claims 9, 14, 23 and 30. Applicants respectfully submit that Paver fails to remedy the above identified deficiencies of Grisenthwaite. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10, 16, 25 and 31 define over Grisenthwaite and Paver, taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claim 10, 16, 25 and 31.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that claims 1-36 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Applicants do not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the limitations of the independent claims and dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants hereby reserve the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the independent or dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to the Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

/Rebecca M. Bachner/

Rebecca M. Bachner, Reg. No. 54,865  
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: May 3, 2010

KACVINSKY LLC  
4500 Brooktree Road  
Suite 102  
Wexford, PA 15090  
(724) 933-5529